



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,115	03/14/2005	Seiji Nakayama	403265	3130
23460	7590	08/14/2009		
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731				EXAMINER
				WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1796		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/14/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Chgpatent@leydig.com  
Chgpatent1@leydig.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/517,115	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAKAYAMA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Ana L. Woodward	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 63-87 and 89 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 63-87 and 89 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-146/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 63-87 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1239008 or U.S. 6,733,853 (both to Takashima et al) in view of U.S. 6,129,961 (Sonoda et al) as per reasons of record.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 21, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants note that all pending claims now require an upper limit of 2 parts by weight of polyamide per 100 parts by weight of polyester while Takashima et al teach a preferred lower limit of 3.1 parts by weight polyamide per 100 parts by weight of polyester. Thus applicants argue that Takashima et al do not teach or suggest using a polyamide content of less than 3.1 parts by weight. Applicants' arguments, however, are not well taken. When the claimed range and the prior art range are very similar (i.e., 2 and 3.1), the range of the prior art establishes *prima facie* obviousness because one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the similar ranges to have the same properties. Furthermore, the disclosure by Takashima et al of a "preferred" embodiment

does not teach away from the entire disclosure of the references, all of which must be considered in the analysis of obviousness.

There is at present no evidence of record demonstrating criticality for applicants' claimed upper limit of 2 parts by weight as compared to the prior art's 3.1 parts by weight. Applicants' reliance on the comparison between Example 13 (0.5 pbw polyamide) and Example 14 (3.0 pbw polyamide) is noted but is not deemed probative of unexpected results for employing applicants' claimed upper limit of 2 pbw. Furthermore, it is unclear as to whether the superior transparency exhibited by Example 13 is not simply the expected additive effect of using a higher content of polyester as compared to polyamide. In this regard, it is known that the polyester inherently possesses excellent clearness (U.S. '853 column 1, lines 23-30, etc.). As to the other elements claimed, it is noted that Takashima et al expressly exemplify i) alkali metal-containing phosphorus contents of 200 ppm or less, which content fulfills both the presently claimed alkali metal atom and phosphorus atom contents and ii) antimony atom contents of less than 200 ppm.

It is maintained that the combination of the cited references provides sufficient disclosure and guidance to one having ordinary skill in the art that control of the various elements claimed, e.g., polyamide content, antimony content, phosphorus content, polyester fine powder content, etc., is important to obtain compositions governed by superior properties inclusive of transparency and flavor retention. Accordingly, no patentability can be seen in the presently claimed subject matter.

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ana L. Woodward/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1796